

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,255,852 of *Forbes et al.* ("*Forbes*").

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,461 of *Jacobs* ("*Jacobs*").

Claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Forbes*.

Claims 8, 10, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Jacobs*.

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Forbes*. Amended claim 1 is a two stage amplifier including a first amplifier stage and a second amplifier stage and a pair of components coupled in series between the first and second amplifier stages that are selected to provide AC decoupling between the first and second amplifier stages and stability in the two stage amplifier. *Forbes* does not disclose a two-stage amplifier as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, *Forbes* discloses signal interconnects for an integrated circuit. (*Forbes*, col. 2, lines 42-67).

The examiner has stated that the driver 110 and the receiver 120 of *Forbes* are the first and second stages of an amplifier. (Page 2, Office Action, 5-4-05). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the driver 110 and the receiver 120 of *Forbes* are not the first and second amplifier stages of a two stage amplifier as claimed in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that the driver 110 and the receiver 120 of *Forbes* are separate components that are interconnected via a transmission line. For example, *Forbes* states that

FIG. 1A shows an integrated circuit 100 in

which a first transmission line, strip line, or coaxial line 101A interconnects circuit components, e.g. a driver 110 to a receiver 120. (*Forbes*, col. 4, lines 46-48) (emphasis added).

Applicant further submits that the elements 103A and 102B in Fig. 1A of *Forbes* are not components coupled in series between the first and second amplifier stages of a two stage amplifier as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, the element 103A is a symbol that represents a portion of the distributed inductance of the transmission line 101A (*Forbes*, col. 4, lines 55-58) and the element 102B is a symbol that represents a portion of the resistance of the transmission line 101A (*Forbes*, col. 4, lines 52-55).

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the two stage amplifier of amended claim 1 having a first and a second component that are selected to provide AC decoupling between its amplifier stages and to provide stability is not anticipated by the separate components, the driver 110 and the receiver 120, of *Forbes* which are connected by a transmission line 101A.

Given that claims 2-10 depend from amended claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-10 are not anticipated by *Forbes*.

It is also submitted that amended claim 11 is not anticipated by *Forbes*. Amended claim 11 includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 1. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 1 and *Forbes* also apply to amended claim 11.

Given that claims 12-20 depend from amended claim 11, it is submitted that claims 12-20 are not anticipated by *Forbes*.

It is further submitted that claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14 and 16 are not obvious in view of *Forbes*. Claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14 and 16 depend from amended claims 1 and 11 and

Forbes does not disclose or suggest a first and a second component coupled in series between the first and second amplifier stages of a two stage amplifier as claimed in amended claims 1 and 11. Instead, *Forbes* discloses separate driver 110 and receiver 120 components which are connected by a transmission line 101A. (*Forbes*, col. 4, lines 47-58).

Applicant also submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Jacobs* because *Jacobs* does not disclose a two stage amplifier having a first and a second component that are selected to provide AC decoupling between its amplifier stages and to provide stability as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, *Jacobs* discloses a power converter 100 with controllable switches. (*Jacobs*, col. 4, lines 12-21).

Given that claims 2-10 depend from amended claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-10 are not anticipated by *Jacobs*.

It is also submitted that amended claim 11 is not anticipated by *Jacobs*. Amended claim 11 includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 1. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 1 and *Jacobs* also apply to amended claim 11.

Given that claims 12-20 depend from amended claim 11, it is submitted that claims 12-20 are not anticipated by *Jacobs*.

Applicants further submit that claims 8, 10, 18, and 20 are not obvious in view of *Jacobs*. Claims 8, 10, 18, and 20 depend from amended claims 1 and 11 and *Jacobs* does not disclose or suggest a first and a second component coupled in series between the first and second amplifier stages of a two stage amplifier as claimed in claims 1 and 11. Instead, *Jacobs* discloses a power converter 100 with controllable switches. (*Jacobs*, col.

4, lines 12-21).

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8-4-05 By: Paul H. Horstmann
Paul H. Horstmann
Reg. No.: 36,167